DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 358 EC 202 594

AUTHOR Ludlow, Barbara L.; Wienke, Wilfred D.
TITLE An On-the-Job Training Program for Rural Teachers of Students with Severe/Profound Handicaps.
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 19p.; In: Linking Programs and Resources for Rural Special Education. Proceedings of the Annual National Conference of the American Council on Rural Special Education; see EC 202 583.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Competency Based Teacher Education; Distance Education; Higher Education; Labor Turnover; *On the Job Training; Practicums; Program Development; *Rural Education; *Severe Disabilities; Social Support Groups; *Special Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Recruitment

ABSTRACT

To meet the need for trained teachers for rural special education, especially for teaching the severely/profoundly handicapped, the Severe/Profound Handicaps Training Program was established by West Virginia University. The program consists of 20 hours of coursework and 9 hours of practicum experience, leading to a Master's degree and/or teaching certification. In each course, competencies in specific skill areas are covered to enable the teacher to meet individual educational and related service needs. The program serves trainees in cohort groups at multiple sites in various geographic locations in West Virginia. The program permits delivery of coursework instruction and supervision of practicum experiences by field-based personnel in cooperation with university faculty. Practicum experiences are conducted on-the-job in the trainees' own rural work settings. Recruitment efforts are aimed at locating individuals currently living in and committed to rural areas. The program attempts to address retention concerns by developing local support groups at each rural site. Program evaluation data indicate that this on-the-job training program is successful in preparing rural teachers of students with severe/profound handicaps and reducing the critical teacher shortage in West Virginia. (JDD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED295358

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rosalee Lewis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Barbara L. Ludlow, Ed.D.
Wilfred D. Wienke, Ed.D.
Special Education Program
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6122
Morgantown, WV 26506

# An On-the-Job Training Program for Rural Teachers of Students with Severe/Profound Handicaps

The preparation of educational personnel to serve handicapped students in rural areas has become a national priority. A number of studies have revealed an alarming shortage of appropriately trained special educators to serve rural schools across the country (Helge, 1981; Smith-Davis et al, 1984; Sontag & Button, 1980). These shortages have created a situation where untrained teachers on temporary out-of-field permits are hired to staff special education programs when qualified personnel are unavailable, a practice that threatens the quality of services (Smith-Davis, 1985; Pipho, 1986). Since most existing personnel preparation programs do not address the development of competencies needed for success in rural areas, even trained teachers are poorly equipped to respond to special needs and problems (Helge, 1983; Sher, 1977). Inappropriate training contributes to teacher turnover when stressful demands of rural teaching cannot be met (Bina, 1981; Marrs, 1983). Attrition rates of special educators in rural schools may be as high as 50% every year (Helge, 1984). The national need for trained teachers for rural special education was formally recognized by Congress in 1983 with the passage of P.L. 96-88 and the resultant "Rural Education Policy Statement."

The passage of H.B. 1271/S. B. 390 by the West Virginia Legislature in 1974 and of P.L. 92-142 by the United States Congress in 1975 created a tremendous need for educators trained in special methods for working with handicapped students, especially those with severe/profound handicapping (SPH) conditions who were previously unserved by the public schools. In addition, court rulings in the Medley and Hartley cases in West Virginia in 1981 have deinstitutionalized the state's residential facilities, returning many severely handicapped students to their own counties and requiring the Department of Education to provide appropriate education to all individuals of school age still confined to institutions. The combined effect of these legislative and litigative actions was to create a situation in which the demand for teachers certified in the area of Severe/Profound Handicaps (SPH) greatly exceeds the supply of qualified and trained personnel. The rural character of the state further compounded the problem, since the low incidence of severe/profound handicapping conditions insured that teaching personnel were few in number and scattered in isolated locations where training programs to improve skills and obtain a professional certificate were not available.

A survey of county school systems revealed that over two-thirds were experiencing difficulties recruiting and retaining special

EC202594

educators, especially for the low incidence handicaps (Ludlow, 1984). A needs assessment survey of programs serving students with severe/profound handicapping conditions identified 82 programs operated by school systems, community agencies and state or private residential facilities employing over 100 professional staff members to provide educational services to nearly 500 school age clients (Ludlow, 1985). These programs projected a need for some 50 additional personnel over the next three years and reported that only 13% of present staff were trained/certified in Severe/Profound Handicaps. To combat these shortages, the state has been forced to rely upon the issuance of temporary, out-of-field teaching permits to individuals who agree to enroll in training programs leading to teaching certification or to accept teachers with the existing certificate in Mental Retardation, even though such programs failed to include any training in the highly specialized techniques essential to appropriate instruction of students with profound mental retardation, serious sensory and physical impairments, and multiple handicapping conditions (West Virginia DOE, 1985). The demand for certified teachers has far surpassed the capacity of institutions of higher education in the state to provide them. New approaches to training were clearly needed to effectively address the critical shortage of certified special educators for students with severe/profound handicaps in West Virginia and other rural areas.

## Program Operation

The WVU Severe/Profound Handicaps Training Program is National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited and state approved to offer a Master's degree and/or teaching certification. The existing program consists of twenty (20) hours of coursework and nine (9) hours of practicum experience offered in the following sequence:

SPED 250 Survey of Exceptional Children & Adults
SPED 319 Assessment: Severe Handicaps
SPED 320 Curriculum: Severe Handicaps
SPED 487 Practicum (3 credits)

SPED 321 Instructional Programming: Severe Handicaps
SPED 322 Physical Handicaps: Characteristics & Methods
SPED 381 Behavior Management of Exceptional Students
SPED 487 Practicum (3 credits)

SPED 323 Teacher Parent Consultation: Handicapped Populations
SPED 324 Classroom-based Language Instruction: Handicapped Populations
SPED 325 Secondary/Adult Programming: Severe Handicaps
SPED 487 Practicum (3 credits)

See Figure 1 for a Student Program Plan.

## Program Competencies

Each of the courses is designed to train seven competencies related to a specific skill area needed to provide instruction to severely/profoundly handicapped students. Program competencies were developed in accordance with existing professional standards (TASH, 1980). Teachers of students with severe/profound handicaps require a

variety of specialized skills to meet individual educational and related service needs (Whitten & Westling, 1985). Behavior management strategies, adapted assessment procedures, and techniques for positioning, handling, and feeding are skills essential to appropriate programming for SPH students (Wilcox, 1977). Training in specialized skills is especially important for teachers in rural areas, where other professional personnel may not be available and teachers are required to provide services such as speech/language therapy, physical therapy and intervention for severe maladaptive behaviors.

A list of competencies for all program courses is included in Figure 2.

The program utilizes a competency-based format with pretestings, individualized training plans and final comprehensive evaluations. Competency-based teacher education (CBTE) has been recommended as an important factor in improving teacher training programs in special education (Blackhurst, 1977). CBTE is an instructional delivery system in which competencies and assessment criteria are specified in behavioral terms, and alternative learning activities are offered (Houston & Howram, 1972). The application of a competency-based approach to the SPH program enables skill acquisition by trainees to be documented more effectively. Pretests have been constructed for courses in the program to assess knowledge, synthesis and simulated application skills on SPH and rural competencies. Lecture notes, individual and group in-class activities and reading are prepared to train each competency. Assignments, quizzes, interviews and final comprehensive exams assess trainee competency acquisition.

## Program Organization and Delivery

The SPH Program is currently organized to serve trainees in cohort groups at multiple sites in different geographic locations across the 33 counties found within the WVU service area. Coursework and practicum experiences are offered in the sequence outlined above across a two year time period by university personnel traveling to rural sites as needed. To date, coursework has been offered to students at three sites in the northern part of the state while a need for training has been identified at sites serving the southeastern, southwestern and northern panhandle regions of the state. No other programs are currently available or planned within the state. Consequently the West Virginia Department of Education has requested the delivery of the WVU Program to all areas of the state. This request will necessitate further changes in the program in the future. The program permits delivery of coursework instruction and supervision of practicum experiences by field-based personnel in cooperation with university faculty. Each course is designed as a complete package containing pretest materials, individualized study guides, syllabus, assignments, lecture notes, individual and group class activities, quizzes and interviews, and a final comprehensive exam. Each practicum experience is summarized in a practicum handbook containing competency requirements, procedures for observing and evaluating teaching competencies, appropriate supervisory techniques, and evaluation forms.

Practicum Facilities

The SPH Program provides three (3) practicum experiences for demonstrating program competencies at intervals distributed throughout the program. Practicum experiences are conducted on-the-job in the trainees' own rural work settings for those currently employed to provide direct education or training services to individuals with severe/profound handicapping conditions. When trainees are not so employed or are working in administrative or supervisory roles, temporary placements are located to permit direct contact with severely handicapped students during practica. To be eligible for the practicum experience, sites must meet the following qualifications:

1. service providing education or training that meets state program standards for severely/profoundly handicapped individuals;
2. direct instructional contact with at least four (4) individuals appropriately classified as severely/profoundly handicapped by state guidelines at ages ranging from 6 to 23 years;
3. permission from the building principal or agency director for practicum to be conducted in the employment setting.

NOTE 1: Because so few personnel in the state of West Virginia possess appropriate training and certification in Severe/Profound Handicaps at the present time, the more traditional Master Teacher Model of practicum experience cannot be provided; university faculty and field-based personnel from this project will provide all practicum supervision to trainees. In the few rural locations where Master Teachers may be available, they are also employed to provide supervision during the practicum experience.

NOTE 2: Preference is given to rural practicum sites that meet federal guidelines for providing educational services in the least restrictive environment, i.e. within public school buildings also serving non-handicapped students of similar chronological age. Since many school systems in West Virginia are still in the process of integrating SPH programs into local schools, some trainees may complete practicum requirements in employment settings housed within residential facilities, day schools and self-contained classrooms.

The SPH Program provides practicum supervision following techniques of the clinical supervision model (Acheson & Gall, 1980), which focuses on observation and evaluation of teaching to foster professional learning and growth. Measurement of performance in terms of behavioral objectives (Piper & Elgart, 1979) allows practicum supervisors to make data-based decisions about trainee acquisition of rural and SPH program competencies. Arranging for observation of trainees in their work settings allows the program to take advantage of an optimal setting for demonstrating and proving teaching skills (Grant et al, 1979; Russell, 1971). Clinical supervision of trainees on-the-job allows project staff to offer more realistic and functional training experiences for SPH teachers.

Recruitment and Retention Procedures

Personnel shortages in West Virginia have been attributed to the failure to attract, employ and retain qualified professional teachers

in rural areas (Ludlow, 1985). Recruitment efforts are aimed at locating individuals currently living in and committed to rural areas. Such local personnel, once trained, are more likely to maintain employment, reducing teacher turnover and improving program stability (Bina, 1981; Marrs, 1983; Wilson, 1981). The priority recruitment group is individuals currently employed to provide educational services to severely handicapped students, since they require and desire training but are unable to pursue full-time studies on campus (Hull & DeSantos, 1979; Culbertson, 1974). The second priority group is those living and/or working in the geographic area and expressing interest in learning to work with severely handicapped students. The last priority group is students not living in rural areas but expressing interest in future employment in rural areas in the area of Severe/Profound Handicaps.

Difficulties in retaining special education personnel in rural areas have been associated with teacher burnout. Several factors that increase the likelihood of burnout in teachers have been identified: lack of a sense of teaching efficacy, inability to detect small changes in progress, minimal support from administrators and pressure from parents (Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1982; Zabel & Zabel, 1980; Weiskopf, 1980). A recent study indicated that job stress contributes to burnout and teacher job dissatisfaction among special educators in rural school systems in West Virginia (Knowles, 1980). Retaining qualified personnel in rural programs is considered essential to maintaining the stability and quality of special education services to severely handicapped students.

The program attempts to address retention concerns by developing local support groups at each rural site by bringing together students, program graduates, field-based personnel and university faculty as well as a network by joining together all sites along with other resource personnel around the state. The support groups allow rural teachers of severely handicapped students to share problems, solutions and concerns, to consult with qualified and experienced field-based resource persons, and to receive advice and technical assistance from university faculty when needed. The network enables faculty to facilitate interaction across sites by suggesting consultants, collecting data on common concerns for presentation to state agencies, and developing a resource directory of persons serving severely handicapped students.

## Program Evaluation

The WVU Special Education Program uses an evaluation plan designed within the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (Provus, 1971) to evaluate the effectiveness of all training programs. Measurement procedures have been developed to collect data as input for formative and summative decisions concerning development and modifications of teacher training programs.

In the SPH programs, evaluation of trainees, program processes, and graduates proceeds according to the following procedures:

1. Transcripts and other records are examined to determine if applicants meet requirements for admission to the program.

2. Prior to program entry, trainees and advisor determine specific program goals and training needs based on the Student Entry Interview and design the Student Program Plan.

3. Student acquisition of competencies during training is measured through course projects and examinations, and the student teaching evaluation submitted by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

4. Information about practicum sites and personnel is collected from trainees and cooperating teachers at the end of each practicum session.

5. Feedback on each course is obtained through course instructor evaluation forms; instructors are free to select the University Senate form or to design a form specifically related to the content and methods of an individual course.

6. The Student Exit Survey is distributed to graduating trainees to collect data on course availability and accessibility, use of facilities and resources, and quantity and quality of faculty and advisor time.

7. The Graduate Follow-up Survey is mailed to program graduates after their first year of employment to assess graduates perceptions of their proficiency in competency areas, the need for and frequency of use of competencies in the classroom setting, and the contribution of the training program to skill acquisition.

8. The Graduate Employer Survey is used to obtain information concerning the performance of graduates in relation to other employees, the usefulness of program competencies in the teaching situation and graduate proficiency and impact on the exceptional population.

Information obtained from the various evaluation procedures described above is used as input for formative and summative decisions affecting program modifications as well as for long range planning decisions, including potential in-service needs. Specifically, in the Discrepancy Evaluation Model, information obtained from evaluation procedures is compared against program standards. The standards which have been selected by the Department of Special Education are as follows:

1. When the measure is a two-choice response, the percentage of respondents selecting the positive alternative must be 67% or better on any item.

2. When the measure is a continum of responses, the mean response across respondents must be better than the score which represents .67 of the total possible score (e.g., 3.5 and a 5-point scale).

Practicum experiences are evaluated by surveys completed by trainees at the end of each practicum. Trainees are asked to rate the appropriateness of requirements, the effectiveness of supervisory personnel, and the usefulness of procedures. The overall program is evaluated by trainees just prior to graduation. The survey form

requires trainees to rate the efficiency of operational aspects of the program as well as their own proficiency in program competencies. The impact of the program on teaching performance is evaluated by graduates and their employers approximately one year following completion of the program. Mail surveys ask graduates to report on their employment status and professional activities and to rate the usefulness of program competencies on the job as well as their own degree of skill. Employers are asked to rate the usefulness of competencies, the proficiency of graduates and their employability compared with others.

The first rural cohort group completed the SPH training program in 1985. Program evaluation data for this group is presented in Figures 3, 4 and 5. The majority of trainees expressed satisfaction with the program and its effectiveness in developing competencies. They reported that most competencies were extremely useful on the job, especially those in behavior management, instructional programming, parent consultation, and alternative communication training. The program was also successful in increasing the pool of trained and certified teachers in Severe/Handicaps in West Virginia . All 18 trainees employed in public school settings have remained in their positions for over two years; five (5) trainees left institutional settings, four to take public school teaching positions, one to go work for an advocacy agency. Three (3) institutional trainees were promoted to supervisory positions upon completion of the program and are now training other staff members. Only three (3) trainees left the state to take employment in other areas, although each remained in the area of Severe/Profound Handicaps.

To summarize the operational aspects of this on-the-job program, the following strengths and weaknesses have been identified:

Strengths:

1. improvement of accessibility of specialized training programs to teachers in rural areas;

2. development of a support system for rural special educators through a local cohort group;

3. use of university personnel for technical assistance in rural classrooms;

4. more practical application of training program competencies in on-the-job settings.

Weaknesses:

1. expense of travel for instructional and supervisory personnel for university to rural training sites;

2. time and energy demands on faculty (including long distance travel, unoccupied time between observation visits, and overnight stays;

3. limited trainee access to university library and personnel resources;

4. difficulties in demonstrating and objectively verifying competencies in practicum settings without continuous supervision.

Although it can be concluded that on-the-job training is an effective model for training teachers in rural areas, a number of issues remain to be resolved.

Issues:

1. what employment situations serve as appropriate practicum experiences? (rural programs may have only one or two students, be poorly supplied with special equipment, or be located in remote locations with little opportunity for integration with non-handicapped peers or community-based training).

2. how can coursework be delivered effectively at rural sites? (supplementary readings, audiovisual aids, curriculum materials may need to be purchased and made available for use at several sites).

3. how can coursework instruction and practicum supervision be scheduled to reduce stress on faculty? (long travel distances, hazardous road conditions and night classes place unusual demands on faculty time and effort).

The overall results suggest that this on-the-job training program was successful in preparing rural teachers of students with Severe/Profound Handicaps and reducing the critical teacher shortage in the state of West Virginia. Many aspects of this field-based model of training may also be applicable to SPH programs in other rural areas of the country as well as for programs in other low incidence areas of special education.

## References


Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1980). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.

Bina, M.J. (1981). Teacher morale in rural areas: Implications for administrators regarding teacher burn-out and attrition. National Rural Project Newsletter, 3:1, 2-3.

Blackhurst, E.A. (1977). Competency-based special education personnel preparation. In R. D. Kneedler & S.G. Tarver (Eds.), Changing perspectives in special education. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Culbertson, D.J. (1974). Corporate role in lifelong learning. In D.W. Vermilye (Ed.), Lifelong education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, G. et al. (Eds.). (1979). On competence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helge, D.I. (1981). Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 47, 514-520.

Helge, D.I. (1984). The state-of-the-art of rural special education. Murray, KY: National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project.

Helge, D.I. (1983). Images: Issues and trends in rural special education. Murray, KY: National Rural Research Project. Center for Innovation and Development.

Houston, W.R. & Howram, R.B. (Eds.) (1972). Competency-based teacher education. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Hull, G.L. & De Santos, V. (1979). How to teach adult learners on their own terms. Audio-visual Instruction, 24 (8), 14-15.

Knowles, B.S. (1981). Psychosocial correlates of teacher pre-burnout: A study of absenteeism, job satisfaction, job stress, and locus of control among special education teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University.

Ludlow, B.L. (1986). Needs assessment survey of school programs serving students with severe handicaps. Unpublished manuscript.

Ludlow, B.L. (1984). Variables influencing special education teacher employment in rural areas. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 6, 24-26.

Marrs, L.W. (1983). Involving citizens and agencies in rural communities in cooperative programming for handicapped students. Murray, KY: National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project.

Piper, T.J. & Elgart, D.B. (1979). Teacher supervision through behavioral objectives. Baltimore: Brookes.

Pipho, C. (1986). Quantity V. Quality: States aim to improve teaching and teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 333-334.

Provus, M.M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Russell, J.D. (1971). Assessment of teacher competencies. In J.E. Weigard (Ed.), Developing teacher competency. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sher, J.P. (1978). A proposal to end federal neglect of rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 280-82.

Smith-Davis, J. (1985). Personnel supply and demand in special education. Counterpoint, December, 1985, 10.

Smith-Davis, J., Burke, P.J., & Noel M.M. (1984). Personnel to educate the handicapped in America: Supply and demand from the programmatic viewpoint. College Park, MD: Institute for the Study of Exceptional Children and Youth, University of Maryland.

Sontag, E., & Button, J. (1980). Office of Special Education breifing paper. Washington, D.C.: USOE.

TASH (1980). Specific competencies required for the education of severely and profoundly handicapped persons. Seattle: The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Weiskopf, P.E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 47, 18-23.

West Virginia Department of Education (1985). The Education of Exceptional Children in West Virginia's County School Districts, 1984-85, Selected Enrollment and Financial Information. Charleston, WV: Bureau of Learning Systems.

Whitten, T.M. & Westling, D.L. (1985). Competencies for teachers of the severely and profoundly handicapped: A review. Teacher Education in Special Education, 8, (2), 104-111.

Wilcox, B. (1977). A competency-based approach to preparing teachers of the severely handicapped: Perspective I. In E. Sontag, J. Smith & N. Certo (Eds.), Educational programming for the severely and profoundly handicapped. Reston: Council for Exceptional Children.

Wilson, S.W. (1981). How to keep them in rural Appalachia. National Rural Project Newsletter, 3, (1), 13.

Ysseldyke, J.E. & Algozzine, B. (1982). Critical Issues in Special & Remedial Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Zabel, R.H. & Zabel, M.K. (1980). Burnout: A cirtical issue for educators. Education Unlimited, 2 (2) 23-25.

FIGURE 1
WVU SPECIAL EDUCATION
STUDENT PROGRAM PLAN

Severe/Profound Handicaps Area

Name: _____ Student No. _____ Date of Entry _____

Option: Degree/Certification  Certification Only  Degree Only

I. REQUIRED COURSES

| Proposed Time | Actual Time | Grade | Course | | Hours |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 250 | Survey of Exceptional Children | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 319 | Assessment: Severe/Profound Handicaps | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 320 | Curriculum: Severe/Profound Handicaps | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 321 | Instructional Programming: Severe/Profound Handicaps | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 322 | Physical Handicaps: Characteristics and Methods | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 323 | Teacher/Parent Consultation: Handicapped Populations | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 324 | Classroom-based Language Intervention Handicapped Population | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 325 | Secondary/Adult Programming: Severe/ Profound Handicaps | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 381 | Behavior Management of Exceptional Individuals | 3 |
| ____ | ____ | ____ | SPED 487 | Practicum | 9 |

II. APPROVED ELECTIVES

____ ____ ____ _____ ____

____ ____ ____ _____ ____

Anticipated Graduation Date: _____ Total Hours: ____

The above constitutes a mutually acceptable and contracted program of study toward certification/Master's degree in Special Education.

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

Advisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

FIGURE 2
COURSE COMPETENCIES
SEVERE/PROFOUND HANDICAPS PROGRAM

Assessment: Severe/Profound Handicaps
Trainees will:

1. Explain principles and practices of assessment for individuals with severe handicapping conditions;
2. Select, administer and adapt assessment instruments for students of different ages with various cognitive, sensory and physical impairments;
3. Describe and evaluate formal measures of assessment used for screening and diagnosis;
4. Describe, evaluate and develop informal measures of assessment used for screening and diagnosis;
5. Design assessment procedures to evaluate pupil progress and program effectiveness;
6. Interpret, integrate and make use of assessment results in planning programs for severely handicapped students;
7. Discuss legal and ethical issues in the selection, administration and interpretation of assessment procedures for identification and placement of handicapped students.

Curriculum: Severe/Profound Handicaps
Trainees will:

1. Identify learning and behavioral characteristics of students with severe/profound/multiple handicaps.
2. Describe models and practices of educational services for students with severe handicapping conditons.
3. Discuss the assumptions, advantages and disadvantages of the developmental, behavioral, and functional models of curriculum.
4. Develop annual goals and short term objectives for the individualized education plan (IEP).
5. Select, prioritize and write task analyses for goals in various content domains.
6. Adjust content emphases to suit the age of students.
7. Evaluate and adapt curriculum guides and programs for specific handicapped students.

Instructional Programming Severe/Profound Handicaps
Trainees will:

1. Explain principles and practices of instruction for severely handicapped students;
2. Arrange instructional settings to accomodate individual and group needs;
3. Select, adapt and design insructional materials to teach functional skills;
4. Plan lessons to reflect individual IEP goals and objectives;
5. Design instructional programs for acquisition and mastery of skills;
6. Design instructional programs for generalization and maintenance of skills;
7. Evaluate instructional effects and student progress.

Physical Handicaps: Characteristics & Methods
Trainees will:

1. Describe patterns of normal physical development and functioning of the major anatomical systems of the human body.
2. Identify characteristics and educational implication of various types of physical disabilities, diseases, sensory deficits, degenerative conditions and mental retardation syndromes.
3. Discuss the legal, ethical and practical issues related to accessibility, safety, medication and related services.
4. Demonstrate proper methods of positioning, transferring and caring for personal medical needs of individuals with physical disabilites.
5. Implement activities to develop grossmotor, finemotor sensorimotor and motor-related cognitive skills.
6. Implement activities to teach self care and independent living skills to physically handicapped students.
7. Select and develop curricular, instructional, mechanical adaptations necessary for teaching individuals with severe or multiple disabilities.

Teacher/Parent Consultation: Handicapped Populations
Trainees will:

1. Describe the historical, legal and social bases for parent involvement in special education;
2. Discuss theories of family structure and development;
3. Identify the financial, social and emotional impact of a handicapped child on the family;
4. Communicate effectively with parents and sibblings of handicapped children in counseling and consultive interactions;
5. Design individuals or group programs to educate/train parents and siblings of handicapped;
6. Communicate effectively with professionals and paraprofessionals on team planning and consultive interactions;
7. Design individual group inservice training plans for professionals or paraprofessionals

Classroom-Based Language Intervention: Handicapped Populations
Trainees will:

1. Discuss theories of language development and language intervention approaches;
2. Describe the normal sequence of langauge development and anomalies associated with handicapping conditions;
3. Conduct assessment of vocal and non-vocal communication skills;
4. Design and implement instructional programs to establish prelanguage communicative behaviors.
5. Design and implement instructional programs for acquisition, generalization and maintenance of basic communication skills;
6. Design and implement instructional programs to increase length grammatical complexity, semantic diversity and intelligibility of communication;
7. Evaluate communication training programs and materials.

Secondary/Adult Programming: Severe/Profound Handicaps
Trainees will:

1. Identify principles and practices of secondary and adult education for persons with severe/profound handicaps;
2. Select, evaluate, modify and develop curricula for secondary/adult programs;
3. Design instructional activities to teach skills for independent living;
4. Design instructional activities to teach skills for community participation;
5. Design instructional activities to teach skills for productive employment;
6. Discuss special concerns of the secondary/adult program: sexuality, marriage, adult living arangements, right to personal freedom and choice, and guardianship;
7. Identify services provided by public and private agencies to handicapped adolescents/adults and their families.

Behavior Management of Exceptional Individuals
Trainees will:

1. Describe behavior in observable, measurable terms, and record behavioral data objectively, accurately and systematically.
2. Identify principles, contingencies and schedules of reinforcement.
3. Collect and analyze data to evaluate interventions in behavior management programs.
4. Select and implement techniques for increasing appropriate behaviors.
5. Select and implement techniques for decreasing inappropriate behaviors.
6. Develop and implement procedures for obtaining stimulus control over behavior, for generalizing behaviors to other stimulus conditions, and for maintaining behavior changes over time.
7. Discuss the legal and ethical issues related to the use of behavior management with handicapped individuals.

Practicum
Trainees will:

Assessment

1. Identify and evaluate the formal and informal assessment instruments currently used by the agency and the approved process for obtaining, collecting and recording assessment data;
2. Develop a battery of instruments to use in planning instructional programs and documenting student progress;
3. Prepare, write and deliver an assessment report to apparent or guardian;

Curriculum

4. Describe, evaluate and modify curriculum currently in use and document, analyze effects of modifications on student progress;
5. Critique and revise student Individual Education Plans (IEPs);
6. Design, implement and evaluate a plan for integration of students into school or community activities involving nonhandicapped peers;

Instruction

7. Chart, analyze and revise schedule of teacher time spent in direct instruction, related service, administrative duties, other activities.

8. Design, implement and evaluate an instructional program through acquisition, generalization and maintenance of skill development;
9. Design, implement and evaluate a plan for community-based training.

Physical Handicaps

10. Develop, implement demonstrate and evaluate a daily schedule for postitioning and trasferring physically handicapped students in a training setting;
11. Develop implement and evaluate an environmental arrangement plan for a classroom of physically handicapped students;
12. Adapt tests, materials and equipments for students with physical and sensory impairments.

Consultation

13. Develop, log, analyze and revise a contact system for regular communication with parents/guardians;
14. Develop, implement and evaluate a plan to use support personnel for instructional assistance to severely handicapped students;
15. Develop, conduct and evaluate a training program for parents or inservice workshop for professionals aspect of instructional programming for severely handicapped students;

Language

16. Identify language objectives for severely handicapped students and incorporate into training in all curriculum areas;
17. Design, implement and evaluate a program to teach an alternative communication mode to nonverbal students;
18. Develop implement and evaluate a training program to facilitate parent participation in language training in the home and community;

Secondary-Adult

19. Conduct a community survey of opportunities for residential placement, vocational training or employment and recreation or social activities for adults with severe handicaps;
20. Develop a plan for transitioning an adult with severe handicaps from school to community service;
21. Document activity in an advocacy role to secure community services for a severely handicapped adolescent or adult;

Behavior Management

22. Identify agency policies and personal philosophy or managing apporpriate and inappropriate behaviors and outline a Contingency Management Plan ranking interventions from least to most drastic alternatives;
23. Design, implement and evaluate a recording/charting system to operate the Contingency Management Plan;
24. Design, implement and evaluate behavior management programs to manage behaviors of individuals and small groups;

FIGURE 3
EVALUATION DATA
PRACTICUM STUDENT SURVEY
SPH TRAINING PROGRAM/FY 84-85

N = 29

| | YES % | NO % | UNDECIDED % |
|---|---|---|---|
| SITE | .72 | .22 | .Ø6 |
| EXPERIENCE | .81 | .12 | .Ø7 |
| UNIV. SUPERVISOR | .64 | .17 | .Ø9 |

STUDENT EXIT SURVEY
SPH TRAINING PROGRAM/FY 84-85

N = 28

| | YES % | NO % | UNDECIDED % |
|---|---|---|---|
| PROGRAM | .85 | .Ø6 | .Ø9 |
| COURSEWORK | .83 | .Ø5 | .12 |
| FACILITIES | .21 | .1Ø | .4Ø |
| FACULTY | .76 | .19 | .Ø3 |
| PRACTICUM | .73 | .1Ø | .Ø7 |

| COMPETENCIES | DEVELOPMENT % | | | PROFICIENCY % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | UNDECIDED | STRONG | ADEQUATE | WEAK |
| FOUNDATIONS | .74 | .Ø5 | .Ø4 | .54 | .32 | --- |
| ASSESSMENT | .62 | --- | .Ø4 | .43 | .41 | --- |
| MANAGEMENT | .71 | .Ø6 | --- | .57 | .28 | --- |
| PROGRAMMING | .76 | .Ø3 | .Ø3 | .54 | .38 | --- |
| COMMUNICATION | .89 | --- | .Ø5 | .54 | .38 | --- |
| RESOURCE USE | .71 | .13 | .Ø2 | .52 | .34 | .Ø2 |
| EVALUATION | .77 | .Ø2 | --- | .41 | .36 | --- |

FIGURE 4
EVALUATION DATA
GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
SPH TRAINING PROGRAM/FY 84-85

N = 13

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Employment
   - WV 10
   - Other 3
   - Unemployed -

2. Agency
   - school 6
   - other 8

3. Position
   - classroom 8
   - other 6

4. Setting
   - self cont. 4
   - res. facility 8
   - other 1

5. Type EC
   - SPH 6
   - other 14

6. Number EC
   - 10 8
   - 10-25 3
   - 26-100 2
   - 100 -

7. Age
   - preschool 3
   - elementary 2
   - secondary 4

8. Time Employed
   - 1 year -
   - 1-3 years 3
   - 3 years 10

9. Certification
   - permanent 5
   - temporary -
   - other 3
   - none 4

10. Status
   - MA 8
   - MA+ 3
   - other 7

11. Activities
   - membership 7
   - meetings 9
   - publication -
   - presentation 3

| COMPETENCIES | USE % | | | PROFICIENCY % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | UNDECIDED | STRONG | ADEQUATE | WEAK |
| FOUNDATION | .74 | .20 | .05 | .38 | .60 | --- |
| ASSESSMENT | .83 | .15 | .03 | .52 | .43 | .05 |
| PLANNING | .88 | .15 | --- | .71 | .23 | .02 |
| ORGANIZATION | .75 | .14 | .06 | .51 | .48 | --- |
| MANAGEMENT | .85 | .12 | .03 | .58 | .38 | .03 |
| PROGRAMMING | .85 | .11 | .03 | .51 | .45 | .02 |
| EVALUATION | .75 | .18 | .06 | .48 | .49 | .02 |
| COMMUNICATION | .72 | .25 | .03 | .45 | .46 | .06 |
| PROF DEVELOPMENT | .85 | .14 | .02 | .43 | .48 | .02 |
| NONTEACHING RESP | .82 | .17 | .02 | .51 | .14 | .03 |

FIGURE 5
EVALUATION DATA
GRADUATE EMPLOYER DATA SURVEY
SPH TRAINING PROGRAM/FY 84-85

N = 17

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Type EC
   - SPH 14
   - other 3

2. Type Agency
   - school 10
   - other 7

3. Training
   - none 4
   - limited 10
   - extensive 2

4. Time Supv.
   - 1 year 2
   - 1-3 years 6
   - 3 years 6

5. Interaction
   - 1 hour
   - 1-5 hours
   - 5 hours

| 6. Ratings | BETTER | SAME | WEAK |
|---|---|---|---|
| knowledge | .71 | .29 | --- |
| skill/teach. | .82 | .06 | .12 |
| interaction | .59 | .41 | --- |
| attitude/ teaching | .76 | .18 | .06 |
| attitude/EC | .82 | .12 | .06 |
| profession-alism | .53 | .47 | --- |

| 7. Practices | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| reemploy | .88 | .06 |
| hire | .94 | --- |

| COMPETENCIES | NEED % | | | PROFICIENCY % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | UNDECIDED | STRONG | ADEQUATE | WEAK |
| FOUNDATIONS | .74 | .01 | .07 | .51 | .26 | .06 |
| ASSESSMENT | .74 | .04 | .05 | .49 | .25 | .08 |
| PLANNING | .81 | .01 | --- | .62 | .13 | .06 |
| ORGANIZATION | .76 | --- | --- | .62 | .13 | .06 |
| MANAGEMENT | .76 | --- | --- | .51 | .18 | .08 |
| PROGRAMMING | .73 | --- | .04 | .50 | .18 | .08 |
| EVALUATION | .74 | --- | .02 | .54 | .18 | .07 |
| COMMUNICATION | .92 | .01 | .07 | .53 | .33 | .07 |
| PROF DEVELOPMENT | .92 | .02 | .06 | .60 | .28 | .05 |
| NONTEACHING RESP | .99 | .01 | --- | .53 | .33 | .02 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE